

### **REMARKS**

Initially, Applicants would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements filed on July 14, 2005 and January 4, 2007 by return of the Forms PTO-1449, for the acknowledgment of Applicants' Claim for priority and Receipt of the certified copy of the priority documents in the Official Action, and for acknowledgment that the drawings are acceptable.

Upon entry of the present paper, claims 1, 3-4, and 6-7 will have been amended to enhance clarity. The present claim amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims, and they were not made in view of the prior art. Accordingly, no prosecution history estoppel should attach to the present claim amendments. Furthermore, no new matter has been introduced by the abovementioned amendments. Thus, claims 1-7 are pending in the present application for consideration by the Examiner.

Applicants address the objection and rejection provided within the Official Action below and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejection of the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

#### **Claim Objection**

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to claim 4 because of an informality. Specifically, line 2 of the claim recited "un unused." In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants have amended line 2 of claim 4 to properly recite "an unused." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection

to the claims. Additionally, the Examiner is respectfully thanked for bringing this matter to Applicants' attention.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,537,635 to DOUGLAS.

Initially, Applicants note that, without agreeing to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection and solely to expedite the patent application process, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-4 and 6-7 to enhance clarity.

In regards to the rejection under § 102, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection. Specifically, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that DOUGLAS fails to disclose an information storage apparatus comprising at least: a memory area including a plurality of partitioned areas, wherein each of the partitioned areas is one of a non-authenticated area accessible without any authentication, an authenticated area accessible only to authenticated devices, and a secure area accessible only to an IC section; and a control section comprising an area update section that updates, when a partition request satisfies update conditions, the number or size of the partitioned areas in the memory according to the partition request. One non-limiting feature of claim 1 provides an advantageous effect of enabling a user to adjust the number and/or size of the non-authenticated, authenticated, and secure areas according to the type and volume of data the user wants to store in the memory area. In other words, a user is able to make the secure area large when a large number of confidential applications are desired to be stored therein, or the user is able to make the secure area small when a small number of confidential applications are desired to be stored therein.

To the contrary, DOUGLAS discloses a method and system for avoiding a cache-full condition in a least recently used (LRU) cache to increase the hit rate in the cache memory. DOUGLAS further discloses the LRU cache as having a plurality of cache partitions and being intercoupled with a processor (CPU). The CPU periodically determines what the optimum size of each cache partition of the LRU cache should be to best carry out the caching policy. Then, based upon the optimum size, the CPU assigns reclaim vectors to each cache partition to specify how many frames should be stolen from a corresponding partition. The total number of frames specified by the reclaim vector is the amount of frames necessary to achieve that partition's optimum size. Accordingly, DOUGLAS, discloses a system and method which periodically determines an optimum size for a plurality of cache partitions and which periodically configures the size of each cache partition in accordance with the determined optimum size.

DOUGLAS, however, does not disclose the cache partitions as being accessible to devices having different security levels. Furthermore, DOUGLAS also fails to disclose at least the additional patentable feature of an IC section that encrypts and writes data to the secure area in the memory area and decrypts and reads encrypted data from the secure area in the memory area. A non-limiting feature of the IC section as recited in claim 1 provides an advantageous effect of making the secure area in the memory area particularly suitable for storing confidential applications.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 2-7, Applicants assert that these claims are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed *supra*. Furthermore, all dependent claims recite additional features which further define the present invention over the references of record.

Accordingly, absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for Patentability at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and respectfully request the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone, or in any proper combination thereof, discloses or renders obvious the present invention, and in further view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Applicants note that the amendments to the claims are to be considered merely clarifying amendments that are cosmetic in nature, and are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. Accordingly, this amendment should not be considered a decision by Applicants to narrow the claims in any way.

If there should be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Masamoto TANABIKI et al..

William S. Boshnick  
Reg. No. 44,550



Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

October 10, 2008  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191